

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would just say, as my friend leaves—I know he has an appointment—the work that has been done in the last few weeks in the Senate has been very important. We have been able to work on the FEMA bill, we worked through the problems with that; China currency, we worked through that. Even though, as my friend, the distinguished Republican leader, knows, I did not agree with the trade bills—what they did—I think it is a good sign of our working together. In spite of strong feelings on both sides, people put that aside. There were no dilatory efforts made to hold them up, and we moved forward. I think that is commendable. That should be the pattern for the rest of this Congress.

I also want the RECORD to be spread with the fact that as far as congressional action, this legislation would not have happened but for the Republican leader. He has been laser focused for a long time, and there were some things we had to work through to get here, but one of the reasons I did what I did to help move this along is because of his feelings about the importance of this legislation.

JOBS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we also need to focus on jobs. It is one of the most important things we can do—I believe the most important we can do. I am sorry that this week my Republican colleagues proved once again that the only jobs they care about are their own. They voted against a plan to create 2 million Americans jobs because they believed it was good Republican politics.

Meanwhile, 14 million unemployed Americans are worried about how they are going to make their rent, put food on the table, and fill their gas tank or how they are going to get another job interview.

These 14 million Americans could care less who proposed the plan or who gets credit to get them back to work. What they care about is that Congress gets to work putting them back to work.

Asked whether they support a plan to ask millionaires to pay their fair share to pay for tax cuts for middle-class families and small businesses, construction of roads and schools, and an extension of unemployment benefits, Americans have overwhelmingly said, yes, they support it.

The reason they do that is because, as we see in the newspaper articles around the country, the news stories: "A quarter of U.S. millionaires pay taxes at a lower rate than some in middle class." It is about a 17-percent average. That is untoward.

Two-thirds of Americans support both the plan the Republicans blocked

this week and the way it is paid for. Yet still, Republicans unanimously voted against these tax cuts, infrastructure investments, and jobs for teachers, police officers, and veterans. They voted, I repeat, against 2 million jobs for American workers.

My Republican colleagues pay lip service to the unemployment crisis in the country, but in the end actions speak louder than words.

As Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, the first African-American woman to be elected from the Deep South to Congress, once said:

The citizens of America expect more. They deserve and they want more than a recital of problems.

The American people demand action. They deserve it. I hope my Republican colleagues would have a plan to create jobs, other than the constant talk about let's get rid of regulations, let's lower taxes.

Let's work together to create jobs. If my friends do not like what the President put forward, come forward with something that is constructive in nature. As Barbara Jordan said:

The citizens of America expect more. They deserve and they want more than a recital of problems.

We can all recite the problems. There are lots of them. But let's work together to create some jobs.

I was happy to hear from some of my Republican colleagues that they want to work together to create jobs. I told one of the Senators: Wonderful. Grab any one of the Democrats; they will work with you to help create these jobs. We need to do something. We do not need to continue to recite the problems. Please get off of this, I say to my Republican friends, about lowering taxes as a way to create jobs. If that, in fact, were the case, the Bush tax cuts would have put this country on an economic machine that could never have been driven so fast. But it did not help.

Eight million jobs were lost during the Bush years with these tax cuts. During the Clinton years, 23 million jobs were created. Let's stop the constant cry: We need to lower taxes. None of us are in favor of raising taxes. But certainly we need a fair tax distribution, and that is why the American people are agreeing with us.

We are willing to work on regulations. There are too many of them. We all agree with that. But let's look specifically at what creates jobs.

One of the big issues we fought about last week was farm dust. OK. Farm dust. EPA does not regulate farm dust. They do not want to regulate farm dust. These are all just, as in the grocery business, loss leaders. It is only a way to confuse the American people. I repeat, EPA does not regulate farm dust. They do not want to regulate farm dust. Let's start talking about that which creates jobs, that which puts people back to work.

We are going to continue to do everything we can not to let the American

people down. We will not stop working to pass the proposals contained in the American Jobs Act just because Republicans have used every obstructionist trick in the book to stop it from moving forward. We will continue to ask the richest Americans to share the burden of getting our economy back on track, and we will never give up in the fight to create jobs for the 14 million people in this country who are out of work.

Remember, the American Jobs Act reduces taxes for everybody, except those who make more than \$1 million a year.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first 30 minutes and the majority controlling the second 30 minutes.

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to, first of all, kind of tag on to the remarks of the leader for just a second. One of the things I wish we would do in this body is get out of the business of demonizing certain segments of our population. Both sides are guilty of it, from time to time. But I wish to particularly talk about the major employer of the United States—small business—and the leader's reference to the 5.6-percent surtax.

Documents show that 392,000 American small businesses would be impacted by a 5.6-percent surtax in order to pay for the President's jobs bill. Records show that 72 percent of the American people are employed by small business.

We have to ask ourselves this question: If we are interested in creating jobs, why would we target the job creator that creates three-fourths of the jobs in America and put a surtax on them? It does not make any sense. If there were sincerity in that offer, those people would first and foremost be carved out on any punitive surtax and we probably would have more employment.

I wanted to make that point. I will join anytime, anyplace, anywhere with the leader to work on creating jobs because that is job one for the United States of America.

I was a small businessman for 33 years, ran a small business for 22 years.

I understand the heart and soul of small business. Today I come to the floor to talk about two small businesses in Georgia and the effect of regulation on those small businesses and the decisions they have made this year that impact employment and the economy.

One is a lovely lady named Susan Kolowich. Susan is a dear friend of my wife's. My wife worked for her for 13 years, has not worked for her in the last 5 or 6 years. She opened a shop in East Cobb County, in Marietta, GA, 23 years ago called C'est Moi—"It is I." She loves France. She would go to France every year and buy, and she would bring back gifts which she sold in her gift shop.

It was a successful small business for 23 years, so successful that her husband Jim, who had been a Subway sandwich shop owner, decided to open a restaurant called Cafe de Paris and join it with her C'est Moi shop so people could come and shop and eat and get a flavor of France. For 10 years he ran the restaurant and for 23 years she ran the store successfully. It was difficult in the last 3 or 4 years because of the economy, but they stayed in business. But finally she threw in the towel and sold the company. She sold her shop, and Jim, her husband, sold his restaurant. They sold them because they were up to here with the oppressive regulation of our government and the continued threat of things exactly like the surtax on their small business at a time in which sales are very difficult. That is not an abstract story, that is the truth. I am sure it is happening in Mississippi, and I am sure it is happening in Wyoming.

Let me talk about a little bit larger small business, Hennessy Jaguar and Hennessy Land Rover over in Atlanta, GA. One of the principals in it is a guy named Steve Hennessy. Steve is a good friend of mine.

On January 3 of this year, I went to the OK Cafe in Atlanta to join a couple for a meeting about some legislation. It is kind of the watering hole for breakfast in Atlanta. Everybody who is anybody kind of goes there. It is a great place to eat. When I walked in the door and walked past the cash register, where you can see out into the cafe, to see if my guests I was going to meet with were there, Steve spotted me. I was not going to meet with him. He jumped up and said: JOHNNY, I need to talk to you now. He ran across the restaurant. I thought he was going to give me a bear hug, he looked so excited. He got up close, and he put his index finger right on my chin. He said: I just fired a salesman and hired two compliance officers to comply with the credit requirements of Dodd-Frank.

So regulation did create two jobs. It created two compliance officers, but it cost a salesman. Well, if you are punishing the salesman and rewarding the compliance officer, the economy is going to go straight down because you are punishing productivity, you are

punishing job creation for the sake of regulatory compliance.

Now, some regulation is good. I believe our job as legislators is to see to it that we mitigate risks for the American people. But this administration appears to think its job is to eliminate risk. Well, if you eliminate risk, you stay in bed—when you wake up in the morning, you stay there until night, you do not do anything because you do not take a risk. Capitalism is about risk. Risk and reward are about our economy.

So when people talk about regulatory oppression, those are two stories in Atlanta, GA, where regulation has actually caused two businesses to be sold and jobs to be lost and another business to hire two people to comply with government regulation and fire someone who was in sales. It is backward at best, and it is wrong.

So I say to the leader, who did make an acknowledgement that he wanted to mitigate regulation, let's sit down and let's find out what we need to do. Let's call a timeout. Let's do what Senator COLLINS from Maine said. Let's take a timeout for a year. Let's try to digest and absorb the regulations we have passed without continuing to put more threatening regulations on top of businesses at a time when we have 9.1 percent unemployment in America, and in my State we have 10.2. It is time for us to be proactive on taking the shackles off American small businesses, not threaten them with surtaxes and not oppress them with regulation. Instead, let's work to empower small businesses to help us come out of this recession.

I think my dear friend Senator BARRASSO, the physician from the great State of Wyoming, wants to address precisely the same subject I am.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. BARRASSO. I am delighted to be joining my colleagues, Senator ISAKSON from Georgia, and Senator WICKER is here also from Mississippi. We think this is very important.

The leader started talking about today and said we need to focus on jobs. That is what we wanted to focus on for all of the time of the Obama administration. But, no, the President ignored jobs—ignored jobs his first year in office, ignored jobs his second year in office. Here we are more than halfway through his third year in office, and finally the President has noticed what has been on the minds of the American people.

This is a President and a majority leader who forced through this body a health care law that is bad for patients; bad for providers, the nurses and doctors who take care of those patients; and bad for taxpayers, ignoring what the American people said they wanted to focus on, which was jobs, the economy, the debt, the spending. We see a majority leader who led this body to adding more to the debt—now \$14 trillion in debt—more debt, more

spending, more money that is owed to China.

We need to put Americans to work. We need to get Americans back to work. The majority leader talked about 14 million Americans looking for jobs. There are over 4 million who have not worked for over a year. In that kind of a situation, it is going to be a lot harder for those folks to ever get a job again—ever get a job again.

And the regulations just keep on coming. A month ago, the President came to the Hill, visited, and had a joint session of Congress. He said: I want to get rid of some of these regulations. He said: I can identify regulations—he came out with a list of about \$4 billion worth of regulations—to lower the cost of business over the next 5 years. But in the month of September alone, this administration came out with 230 proposed rules and 338 final rules. And if you go to what this administration says that those rules are going to cost the people of this country, cost the job creators of this country, even the administration, using their own numbers, that cost is going to be \$10 billion.

I heard our colleague from Georgia talk about the paperwork, the compliance officers. Just yesterday, this administration came out, under Dodd-Frank, with new rules and regulations—proposed rules. They took only 11 pages of this massive bill, but only 11 pages, and when you look at the 298 pages of proposed rules that have come out, what do the government regulators, the Obama administration regulators, say it is going to cost the businesses of this country in terms of manhours having to be spent to comply with the paperwork? These aren't my numbers, these aren't Senators ISAKSON's numbers, these aren't Senator WICKER's numbers. Mr. President, 6,283,000 hours of paperwork. That is what the government experts say is going to have to be spent on paperwork to comply with one component of the Dodd-Frank law. How is that going to help? How is that kind of a drag on a society going to help create jobs?

You know, the President says: If the Republicans have ideas, we want to hear them. The majority leader stood here and said: If the Republicans have ideas, we want to hear them. Well, a month ago, a month ago to this day, when the President came to the Hill, earlier that morning a number of colleagues, House and Senate Members, came to talk about a Western Caucus Jobs Frontier bill, a number of bills Republicans have proposed breaking down Washington's barriers to America's red, white, and blue jobs.

The majority leader said we ought to spend more money. The President said we ought to spend more money. The President talked about his so-called stimulus plan, and he said it was going to save or create 3.5 million jobs. We have lost millions of jobs since this President came into office.

The President talked about green jobs. He said his clean-energy policies

would create 5 million new jobs. We have just seen the Solyndra situation—1,100 people fired because of bad bets by this administration. This is an administration that should not be betting with the taxpayers' money. It is not the administration's money. It is not the President's money. That is why the American people are so up in arms. They see what all of this spending is doing, and it is not helping jobs.

I see my colleague from Mississippi is here. We can go back and forth and talk about this. I know he has examples and situations in Mississippi. I see them in Wyoming all of the time, people having to deal with the redtape coming out of Washington. The President talks a pretty good game, but when you look at what is happening out there, the American people are very disappointed. The American people deserve better than what they are getting from this administration.

So I would ask my colleague from Mississippi whether there are things he sees happening to his friends and neighbors at home that we need to share with the rest of the country?

Mr. WICKER. Well, there is no question about it. I appreciate my two friends coming down and helping with this colloquy today.

There are two companies I want to talk about in a moment, but let me say at the outset that we all want to create jobs for Americans, there is no question about it. The President came into office wanting to create jobs. The problem is, he has not let history be a guide.

If we go ahead with this second stimulus bill, we will be following the same failed programs that not only have not created jobs for Americans, but, as a matter of fact, the policies have made things worse for Americans and for job creation. The President's proposal and the proposal the majority leader just embraced is a "spend now, pay later" approach. It is one that has been proven not to work. Three years after we tried this at the beginning of the President's term, we have not put more Americans back to work.

This should be a glaring reminder of the failures of the first stimulus package and the probability and likelihood that this second stimulus package would be met with the same result. What we have seen since the first stimulus is that the Federal debt has skyrocketed, there are nearly 2 million fewer jobs, and the economic growth is limping along at a meager 1 percent. So many other countries have a higher GDP growth than that. It is tragic that our country has not kept up. The unemployment rate has hovered at 9 percent for 30 months in a row. If you add in those who have given up looking for work or settled for part-time work, that number skyrockets from around 9 percent unemployment, which is an unspeakable number, to some 16 percent. In fact, some 6 million people have been without a job for more than 6 months.

We know the President's policies are not working. We have seen very slow movement and, frankly, in many instances, that movement has been backward. The big-government approach of spend now and pay later has simply been a wet blanket for America's job creators.

The fact is there are some things on which we can agree. In this time of divided government, we must approach the idea of job creation in a bipartisan manner. The House of Representatives is controlled by Republicans. This body is controlled by Democrats. The executive branch, including the regulatory regime in this country, is strictly controlled by the Democratic Party. So we need to work together in a step-by-step approach.

A comprehensive package of "pass this bill, pass this bill immediately without amendments" has been rejected by both Democrats and Republicans in this city, and we now need to embark on a step-by-step approach, and we can be quick about it. One example was yesterday. When we finally got around to it, the House of Representatives passed the trade bills, once the President sent them to us. That was done yesterday afternoon. By 7 or 8 last evening, the Senate passed all of these trade agreements on a huge bipartisan basis. So this is a step in the right direction. There are other things we can do. But I wish to commend the President for finally sending the trade bills to the Congress and for getting that done and opening the new markets. So that is a step.

The Senator from Georgia mentioned some companies and some potential job creators in his State. My friend from Wyoming asked me to talk about examples in Mississippi.

Actually, my wife Gail and I had an opportunity to participate in a christening of some boats in Gulfport, MS, just the day before yesterday. This was at the construction area of Trinity Yachts. I know what the initial reaction is: Why should we be concerned with yachts? I tell you why we should be concerned with yachts. Because we employ thousands upon thousands of Americans building those yachts.

I will never own a yacht. I don't aspire to even travel on a yacht. But I am glad there are a bunch of people around the world who want to buy them, because we employ a thousand people at Trinity Yachts, and we want to increase that.

As a matter of fact, what we helped christen the day before yesterday was not a yacht at all, it was two tugboats. Trinity Yacht makes tugboats, and they will be helping bring liquefied natural gas into the port of Pascagoula. So this shipyard built the tugs, Signet Maritime bought the tugs, and they will be creating jobs in Gulfport, and will be creating jobs at the Port of Pascagoula, and they want to create a lot more jobs.

I was told by the management and ownership of Trinity Yachts that busi-

ness is a little soft in the shipyard. But if the President would simply go back to what we used to have in terms of oil and gas permitting, if we would lift this de facto ban on oil wells in the Gulf of Mexico and get back to the business we had year before last, then business could be great guns at Trinity Yachts.

We are not talking about yachts being constructed by Trinity, we are talking about oil and gas drilling platforms. The quicker permits and drilling projects in the Gulf of Mexico could bring about more than 200,000 new jobs in the next year. That is a job creator proposal that is simple. All we need to do is enforce the law that is currently on the books and get back to permitting so we can get back to producing our own energy.

The oil and natural gas sector is responsible for 9 million jobs, according to the Congressional Research Service, and we have in America the largest recoverable stores of natural gas, oil, and coal on Earth. So if you want to know another Republican proposal—which is a bipartisan proposal when you get down to it, because our gulf coast delegation consists of Republicans and Democrats—then here is a concrete proposal: Let's get back to producing our own energy resources in the Gulf of Mexico and elsewhere in the United States. Nine million jobs, and it could be more.

Mr. ISAKSON. The Senator from Mississippi jogged my memory, and I want to jog his. He was in the House of Representatives in 1994, if I am not mistaken. I got here in 1999. But I remember the first year of the Clinton administration, when they put a luxury tax on yachts, yacht construction went out of business and thousands of jobs were lost. I don't know if Trinity is a sub S, an LLC, or a sole proprietorship, but it is probably one of those three types of corporations, and I am sure it is a small business. They are going to have a 5.6-percent surtax on their income because of what is in the proposal of the President, which is, allegedly, to pay for a jobs bill. So this is *deja vu* all over again. The administration is imposing more taxes to pay for government jobs that take money out of the pockets of small business that creates the jobs in America.

Trinity Yachts—and I will do some research to find out if that is true, because I don't know the company—I will bet is one of the ones that pays their taxes as if they were an individual, and they would be affected by the tax the President is proposing, just like the yacht industry that was put out of business in 1993 because of the Clinton tax. So the Republicans took over in 1994 and reformed the Tax Code and cut Federal spending.

Mr. WICKER. The point is, they are a bunch of average, hard-working Mississippians, average, hard-working Americans, who are glad to come to work each day, working hard to build these boats, and we ought to encourage them.

I don't know the corporate structure of that particular job creator, but I know the larger point is that many of the job creators do pay taxes at the individual level. We know from research that four out of five of the taxpayers who would pay the higher taxes being proposed by the President are business owners—the very people we are hoping will create jobs, and create them soon for Americans.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his stories, which are true and to the point. My story was about two small businesses. And I thank the Senator physician from the great State of Wyoming, and I would ask if he has any additional remarks.

Mr. BARRASSO. Well, I know you see this in Georgia and in Mississippi. We know what doesn't work. We know what doesn't work is more borrowing and more spending and overregulation and the threat of raising taxes on people and the job creators of this country. So there is much to be done, and that is why we actually came out with this Jobs Frontier—the western caucus did—because we want to increase affordable American energy.

The President, when he was running for office, said under his proposals electricity costs would necessarily skyrocket. If you want a productive, vibrant economy, you need low-cost energy, and if you want a secure nation, you need American energy to do that. So when my colleague from the Gulf State of Mississippi talks about energy in the gulf, there is a lot there. I can talk about Wyoming from the standpoint of energy being available on Federal land, which is being blocked by regulations. We ought to be exploring for that energy as well as in Alaska. So there is much we can do to make our country stronger, safer, more secure, better, and more vibrant, but the proposal put forth by the President—and here I agree with my colleague from Mississippi—is another spending bill—just spending—as the first stimulus was. It is a bill that is not going to do what we need to do to get this economy going in a vibrant sense. From my perspective, the No. 1 thing we should do is stop doing what we know doesn't work.

Mr. ISAKSON. Well, I want to conclude, unless the Senator from Mississippi has anything to add.

Mr. WICKER. Well, just to say this, and I will take a minute to say it and then I will thank my friend from Georgia for taking the lead on this colloquy.

We also need to show job creators that we are actually serious about fixing our fiscal house. You know, we have had the Gang of 6, we have had the Simpson-Bowles Commission, we have had Dr. COBURN and Senator LIEBERMAN with a proposal, and we have had Alice Rivlin's proposal—an expert on budgetary matters. We know the solutions that are out there, and they are hard to do politically. They would subject us all to intense political criticism

and a firestorm. But if we do it on a bipartisan basis for the good of this country now, for the good of not only job creators today and people out there who are dying to come back to work but also for future generations, then we can do the right thing.

I will simply say this: I call on the President of the United States to give us some leadership on working together on a bipartisan basis to make these tough decisions. If we do it together, as Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill did in the 1980s, we can make the case to the American people that sometimes you have to do hard things, but we do things on a bipartisan basis to create jobs and to make a better future for future generations. It will not be done unless the Chief Executive of the United States of America comes forward and signals a willingness to hold hands with us and do the right thing for the future.

I desperately hope in these final months of 2011 we can get that signal sent to the committee of 12, and that we can work together to make major, significant structural changes that will save our fiscal future.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi, and I will close by simply saying you have heard three Republicans this morning talking about differences we might have on regulation and on tax policy, but you have also heard the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the physician Senator from Wyoming, and myself, from the State of Georgia, say we are ready, we are willing, and we are hopeful that we can sit down together as a Congress—not as a partisan Congress but as a bipartisan Congress—and find solutions to the regulatory problems, find incentives for businesses to invest, and find ways we can create jobs in the private sector, because in the end that is where job creation takes place.

I will end with where Senator REID started in his remarks. Yesterday was a landmark day. Republicans and Democrats came together and passed three free-trade agreements which will create jobs in the United States of America. Our problem is we waited almost a thousand days to do it. Let's start accelerating those decisions that must be made to bring us together. Let's find ways to cut our spending, empower our businesses, and find ways to regulate in a positive way, not in a suppressive and oppressive way on American small businesses.

Senator WICKER, Senator ISAKSON, and Senator BARRASSO are three who stand ready to join in doing that, anytime, anyplace, anywhere.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to speak about what is currently an unpopular topic in this town. It has become no longer politically correct in certain circles in Washington to speak about climate change or carbon pollution or how carbon pollution is causing our climate to change.

This is a peculiar condition of Washington. If you go out into, say, our military and intelligence communities, they understand and are planning for the effects of carbon pollution on climate change. They see it as a national security risk. If you go out into our nonpolluting business and financial communities, they see this as a real and important problem. And, of course, it goes without saying our scientific community is all over this concern. But as I said, Washington is a peculiar place, and here it is getting very little traction.

Here in Washington we feel the dark hand of the polluters tapping so many shoulders. And where there is power and money behind that dark hand, therefore, a lot of attention is paid to that little tap on the shoulder. What we overlook is that nature—God's Earth—is also tapping us all on the shoulder, with messages we ignore at our peril. We ignore the messages of nature—of God's Earth—and we ignore the laws of nature—of God's Earth—at our very grave peril.

There is a wave of very justifiable economic frustration that has swept through our Capitol. The problem is that some of the special interests—the polluters—have insinuated themselves into that wave, sort of like parasites that creep into the body of a host animal, and from there they are working terrible mischief. They are propagating two big lies. One is that environmental regulations are a burden to the economy and we need to lift those burdens to spur our economic recovery. The second is the jury is still out on climate changes caused by carbon pollution, so we don't need to worry about it or even take precautions. Both are, frankly, outright false.

Environmental regulation is well established to be good for the economy. It may add costs to you if you are a polluter, but polluters usually exaggerate about that.

For instance, before the 1990 acid rain rules went into effect, Peabody Coal estimated that compliance would cost \$3.9 billion. The Edison Electric Institute chimed in and estimated that compliance would cost \$4 to \$5 billion. Well, in fact, the Energy Information